

SUMMARY OF WORKSHOP COMMENTS
SACRAMENTO, CA

<i>Date:</i> June 9, 2005 1:00 – 5:00 p.m.	<i>Location:</i> Sacramento Sterling Hotel 1300 H Street, Sacramento, CA
<i>Meeting Purpose and Goals:</i>	To hear and record public comment on the Public Review Draft of the California Water Plan Update 2005
All meeting materials, including the PowerPoint presentation, are available on the California Water Plan website at: http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/materials/index.cfm	

Presenters:

Lisa Beutler, Facilitator, Center for Collaborative Policy, CA State University, Sacramento
Mary Ann Dickinson, Advisory Committee member, CA Urban Water Conservation Council
Kamyar Guivetchi, Manager, Statewide Water Planning, CA Department of Water Resources (DWR)
Steve Macaulay, Advisory Committee member, CA Urban Water Agencies
Karl Winkler, Chief, Central District, DWR

Introduction: Format and Purpose

Lisa Beutler, meeting facilitator, introduced the presenters and DWR staff and welcomed everyone to the CA Water Plan Update 2005 Public Input Workshop in Sacramento. The purpose of the meeting was for the CA Department of Water Resources (DWR) to receive public input and to share ideas for the Public Review Draft of the CA Water Plan.

The workshop format was interactive. The meeting consisted of 3 presentations by Kamyar Guivetchi (DWR), followed by group discussion at each table. Advisory Committee members Grant Davis and Fran Garland spoke on behalf of the CA Water Plan Update 2005 Advisory Committee, and DWR Central District Chief Karl Winkler gave a presentation on the Sacramento River and Mountain Counties Regional Reports, which are located in Volume 3 of the CA Water Plan. Each table station had a DWR staff person who helped record the group discussion on a flipchart. Each table group chose a reporter among themselves who would report back flipchart notes to the entire audience on behalf of the group. Near the end of the meeting, time was reserved for individuals to orally present prepared statements. For detailed description of the format, see the “Working in Groups” handout.

Part 1 – Agenda Items A and B

A) Background & Overview / B) Comments from the Advisory Committee

This *Water Plan Update* is different than previous updates. It was prepared using a new process. There are many new features in the Water Plan. It will be continually updated as new information becomes available, and it presents a strategic plan and framework for action developed with substantial stakeholder input. Kamyar Guivetchi spoke on the process and content of the Water Plan. Advisory Committee members Mary Ann Dickinson and Steve Macaulay explained the *Advisory Committee View*, a 4-page handout prepared by the Advisory Committee that summarizes the areas of agreement

and points of disagreement among the Advisory Committee over the last four and a half years, and the remaining areas of uncertainty.

Below is a summary of the comments made at the tables in response to these questions:

Thinking about the presentation on Background and Overview by DWR and Comments from the Advisory Committee, what are the things you:

Liked	Would Change	Don't Know, Have Questions About:
<p>Table 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Scenarios are a better approach than a <u>single</u> gap analysis. + Process was made easily accessible. + Environmental water use overtly discussed; real commitment to look at the needs of the environment. + Representative year data are a useful tool. + Water quality focus. + Shows regional potential for integrated resource management and self-sufficiency. + Specific call-out of tribal and environmental justice concerns. <p>Table 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Good to use the Advisory Committee. <p>Table 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Liked looking at hydrologic regions separately. + Liked how this Water Plan integrates water quality and flood control issues. <p>Table 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Use/role of the Advisory Committee is good – continue. + State should emphasize <u>technical</u> assistance to regions to develop integrated resource plans – especially to regions that do not have resources to develop IRPs. <p>Table 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Good presentation for people without prior knowledge. + Like scenario approach. + Like the variety of resource management strategies. + Like how this Water Plan effort 	<p>Table 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Δ Gap analysis is missing Δ More diversity on the Advisory Committee. Δ Advisory Committee has too much influence on outcome early on, should be more “advisory.” <p>Table 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Δ Don't include environmental justice or global climate change or ecosystem restoration. Different groups are in charge of those issues. Δ Expand “recycled municipal water” section. <p>Table 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Δ Need statewide gap analysis. Δ Need regional gap analysis. Δ Prefer the standard public hearing format (as opposed to workshop format). Δ Current workshop process not conducive to public comment <p>Table 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Δ Would have liked to see more input from Water Board. Need to include all regional boards for uniformity. Δ Would like to see comparisons between this Water Plan Update's data and projections and what previous Water Plans had predicted. Δ Work harder on identifying what we know and don't know so we can identify data gaps and fill them. Δ Bring more everyday people into the process. Δ Need better land use data and planning on local level, water quality. 	<p>Table 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How will environmental protections be taken into consideration as projects are updated? • How was 2 MAF overdraft determined – was it data or estimates? <p>Table 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain why Environmental Justice is included in the Water Plan. • How is water conserved if it runs out into the ocean in the North Coast? • How is water conserved if it evaporates off of a plant surface or soil or during transport? • Why are sucker fish discussed in the North Coast Regional Report – shouldn't it be in the North Lahontan Region (Modoc County)? • How was agricultural water use efficiency determined or measured? How was potential for improvement determined or measured? • How was urban water use efficiency determined or measured? How was potential for improvement determined or measured? • Disappointed that there is no gap analysis. • Selection of Advisory Committee members was biased – not an equal representation among stakeholders. <p>Table 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This Water Plan is more of a

<p>has been more comprehensive, with considerations of water quality, the environment, and economics.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Many options for regions to make decisions. + Metropolitan Water District appreciates the effort and goes along with it. <p>Individual Comment form:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Open, inclusive process. + Wider group of participants, open to new data & perspectives. + Facilitation process and openness of DWR staff. + Liked the website. 	<p>Individual Comment Form:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Δ I would like to see prioritization of strategies. Δ The public comment process was difficult for our group to get a handle on. We felt it stifled us. 	<p>political document rather than a technical document; does not necessarily give hard information on how to make decisions; less technical than it ought to be.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water Plan and CALFED planning effort are possibly duplicating each other – they should complement each other instead. • Document appears to be more than a science document. • Regional water planning (water quality, flood control, etc.) needs to be integrated into other planning efforts, rather than supersede them. <p>Table 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many participants are here to learn – no specific comments at this time. • What has been implemented from the 1998 Update of the Water Plan? Does this Update discuss this? • Previous Water Plan Updates used to record applied and consumed water, depletion. Compare today’s values with those. • Why is groundwater not discussed? <p>Individual Comment form:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where are the data on groundwater overdraft – is there actual data, or is it a “guesstimate”?
---	---	---

Part 2 – Agenda Items C and D

C) California Water Today & Water Balance / D) Regional Reports

It is important for a strategic plan to have a clear description of current conditions and accomplishments. Chapter 3 of Volume 1 (Strategic Plan) is called “California Water Today.” As the largest chapter in Volume 1, it is intended to provide education and reference information. It gives general findings from both statewide and regional perspectives as well as the perspectives of different water use sectors (agriculture, urban, and environment). Volume 3 of the Water Plan has more detailed information on each of the 10 hydrologic regions (plus additional reports for Statewide, Mountain Counties, and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta), covering conditions, challenges, accomplishments, and future opportunities of the Region presented, as well as quantified water balances for supply and use. Kamyar Guivetchi presented slides on California Water Today and

statewide water balances, and Central District Chief Karl Winkler summarized the Volume 3 reports for the Sacramento River and the Mountain Counties regions.

Below is a summary of the comments made at the tables in response to these questions:

Thinking about the description of California Water Today and the Regional Reports, what are the things you:

Liked	Would Change	Don't Know, Have Questions About:
<p>Table 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Shows challenges of each regional and opportunities for solutions. + Regional balances and upload to statewide water balance. <p>Table 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Integrated regional plans are a better idea than county plans. <p>Table 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Regional maps with arrows work well. 	<p>Table 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Δ Show a <u>series</u> of drought years (not a single dry year). Δ Need multi-year responses (gaming) for wet and dry Δ Need mechanism for identifying key messages and commonality between regions at the statewide level, rather than discrete analysis of separate regions. Δ Missing San Joaquin River Flow, p. 12-24. Δ Explain assumptions for regional demand scenarios (more footnotes or details). Δ Add more economics to the analyses. <p>Table 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Δ Look more at recycled water for landscaping. Δ Need to have a multiple drought year. <p>Table 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Δ Problem with balances – gives impression that Wild and Scenic River use is the largest use, when in reality it goes to meet other uses. Δ Need to show that much mercury pollution is naturally occurring. Δ Water balances are too complicated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Does not communicate ○ Needs to inform the legislature and the public <p>Table 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Δ Water Portfolios and other diagrams difficult to follow (larger print would help). Δ Absorbing information is a little like “drinking from a fire 	<p>Table 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Off-stream storage sites by regions. <p>Table 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How much interrelationships can there be between surface and groundwater if groundwater is controlled by local interests? • Don't know how much groundwater we have – hard to measure. Estimates that there is 4 to 5 times as much groundwater as surface water. • Authority of State Water Resources Control Board to change water rights. Is this a positive thing? DWR is apparently using it as a positive example in the document (under “accomplishments”). • Perceptions problems with recycled water, not being used in places where can be leached into groundwater wells. • More piping should be installed for recycled water. • The State Water Resources Control Board's recommendation in 13-6 to make changes to water rights is questioned as an invitation to change water rights? An explanation would be helpful. <p>Table 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Algal blooms are not necessarily caused by humans • Land acquisition has tax, 3rd party, regulatory, and cross boundary impacts. • How accurate are the CALFED reports put into the Water Plan? • Sacramento Regional Report

	<p>hose.”</p> <p>Individual Comment forms:</p> <p>Δ Identify wild and scenic rivers with environmental water deficits.</p> <p>Δ Recommend amounts needed to restore and maintain the free flowing character and outstanding values of designated rivers with water deficits.</p> <p>Δ Sacramento River Regional Water Balance gives the impression that Wild & Scenic Rivers have large amounts of water allocated to them. Actually, most Wild & Scenic River water is allocated and redirected toward agricultural and urban use.</p> <p>Δ Sacramento River Regional Water Balance grossly overestimates the amount of water “allocated” to Wild & Scenic Rivers. All 8 federal and state Wild & Scenic Rivers on the west slope of the Sierras flow into large reservoirs where their water is used for consumptive purposes. All 7 W&S Rivers in North Coast flow to the ocean but several have major diversions for consumptive purposes that create environmental deficits. Both eastern Sierra rivers in the W&S system are entirely diverted downstream for consumptive purposes.</p> <p>Δ Check with Environmental Defense on their environmental water. The study shows the <u>baseline</u> (i.e. minimum) of what the environment needs. It’s not an indication of what will provide for a healthy environment.</p>	<p>does not accurately show what is occurring – sugar coats problems.</p>
--	---	---

Part 3 – Agenda Items E and F

E) Preparing for the Future (Scenarios) / F) Diversifying Responses (Strategies)

This *Water Plan Update 2005* recognizes that many things may alter water use between now and 2030. For that reason, the *Update* contains a description of several possible future scenarios. Uncertainty about future course or events creates a need for multiple options to address opportunities and challenges. Further, the Plan recognizes that one size does not fit all. Each Region will have specific requirements or needs that may not apply across the entire state. Implementing multiple options (diverse management strategies) allows planners and managers to adapt to a variety of circumstances. Volume 2: Resource Management Strategies has narrative descriptions of 25 different strategies available to water managers to help them reduce water demand, improve operational efficiency and transfers, increase water supply, improve water quality, and practice resource stewardship.

Below is a summary of the comments made by individuals at the tables:

Thinking from the perspective of 2030, are there things about this approach to plan for the future you:

Liked	Would Change	Don't Know, Have Questions About:
<p>Table 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Okay not to have “gap” number but broaden consideration to more issues and variables + Volume 4 data assumptions documents <p>Table 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Water Portfolio years should also analyze drought supplies/uses (modeling) + Keep number of scenarios to a minimum (3 is good) <p>Table 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Laying out 3 scenarios is a good idea + Assumptions well described <p>Individual Comment forms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Liked that there can be different futures. 	<p>Table 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Δ Lack of assumption documentation in the <i>Highlights</i> bar charts Δ Attempt to incorporate scenarios with management strategies to identify benefits of various mixes <p>Table 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Δ Emphasize the technical assistance that can be provided by state to the regions to develop integrated regional plans, especially those that do not have resources <p>Table 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Δ Need insight into effect of contamination on water supply. Δ Need more cost information on the water supply strategy alternatives. <p>Individual Comment forms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Δ Combine info on pages 4-5 with page 15 to develop a 4th scenario that more accurately describes a less resource intensive or environmentally benign alternative future. 	<p>Table 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why only 2030? What about more detailed projections further out? <p>Table 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What happens to rainfall that doesn't runoff? • Future urban water use will be less due to smaller lawns. • Smaller lawns and more concrete will mean more rainfall water runoff. <p>Table 4:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Scenarios must be <u>realistic</u>. <p>Table 5:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have you considered how the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) factors into the water plan? • Consideration of economic incentives was the substance of disagreements among the Advisory Committee

Part 4 – Additional Public Comments

Liked	Would Change	Don't Know, Have Questions About:
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> + Shows challenges of each region and opportunities for solutions + Regional balances upload into statewide water balance + Great that we can have a meeting like this, with lots of people giving their perspective. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Δ Plan for how to do next update 2010. Δ Consider need to incorporate into Urban Water Management Plans due in 2010 (so maybe release 2008 or 2009?) Δ Clearly identify the take home messages of charts in the <i>Highlights</i> document. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why only 2030? What about more detailed projections further out? • How much advertising was done for these meetings? Seemed sketchy.

Part 5 – Formal Public Comments (in order of presentation):

Members of the public were welcome to present statements in the formal style of a traditional public hearing. Four members of the public were registered for speaker comments:

David Bolland, Association of California Water Agencies (ACWA)

Mr. Bolland wanted to bring attention to a document that ACWA wrote called *No Time to Waste: A Blueprint for California Water*. Mr. Bolland stated that the *CA Water Plan Update 2005* and ACWA's *Blueprint* are complimentary efforts. ACWA used much of DWR's data and information to make its own conclusions. Regional accomplishments and needs are recognized in both documents. There are a variety of solutions and methods for water management identified in both documents.

Mr. Bolland stated that ACWA is encouraging its member agencies to look at the regional reports and provide specific comments to help develop them. ACWA would like to see a more proactive state response to climate change, groundwater pollution, and xenobiotics issues. ACWA would like more policy commitment on part of the state on these issues in the strategic plan. ACWA would also like the state to strengthen its commitment to rebuilding and developing new surface and groundwater storage for statewide benefit. They also want the state to facilitate local and regional projects to enhance water reliability. Mr. Bolland agreed with the Water Plan's identification of conservation and reuse as essential to all use sectors, but he felt conservation and reuse are not enough for the growth scenarios. He suggested that the Water Plan focus and articulate more on the San Joaquin-Sacramento Delta; he felt there was not enough recognition of physical and ecological processes, which are in crisis and need unprecedented responses. He also hoped that DWR would adopt ACWA's recommendation for a high-level, gubernatorially-appointed commission to examine an immediate and comprehensive response to the Bay Delta situation.

Mindy McIntyre: Planning and Conservation League (PCL):

Ms. McIntyre stated that PCL has produced another water plan that is complementary to *CA Water Plan Update 2005*, using much of the same data. Overall, the new Water Plan Update is a huge improvement over past Bulletin 160's. It demonstrates that California can feasibly use less water in 2030 than we do today and that we have many options to improve reliability, such as conservation,

recycling, and groundwater treatment that are both cost effective and environmentally beneficial. On behalf of PCL, Ms. McIntyre thanked DWR for confirming PCL's findings. PCL feels that the Desalination resource management strategy in Volume 2 should be divided into two separate strategies: seawater desalination and groundwater desalination. Some other issues will be brought up in formal written comments, forthcoming.

Mike Vukelich, Farm Bureau

Mr. Vukelich thanked DWR for holding the many Water Plan public workshops across the state. He had also attended the workshop in Oakland, and he enjoyed learning about other points of view. Mr. Vukelich stated that he is affiliated with the Farm Bureau, but his own statements do not necessarily reflect that of the Bureau. Not everyone believes in global warming and some people believe environment takes care of itself. He commended the effort that went into the Water Plan, even though he disagreed with much of it. He felt that the biggest contribution to conservation should be saving water that would otherwise go to the ocean. Mr. Vukelich suggested that water from the North Coast rivers should be used for the rest of the state.

Mr. Vukelich stated concern that the Water Plan covers too many issues and should focus more on water supply. He did not believe that global warming is occurring and felt that it is inappropriate for the Water Plan to make recommendations on climate change.

Steve Evans – Friends of the River (FOR)

Mr. Evans stated that FOR had commented on the 1998 Water Plan, and they saw this version of the Water Plan to be greatly improved. FOR is in support of the conclusion that California can more efficiently use its existing water supplies and meet its future needs. Mr. Evans stated that FOR was disappointed that the Water Plan assumes the eventual development of the CALFED surface storage projects.

Mr. Evans called attention to two particular bar graphs on the *Water Plan Highlights* brochure document. The first graph was the "Range of Additional Supply for Eight Resource Management Choices" on page 15 that indicates that, at the low threshold, CALFED surface storage projects produce less water supply than any other resource management strategy. FOR believed that this graph reinforces its view that California has more potential to invest in water use efficiency, water recycling, and conjunctive use of groundwater. Mr. Evans stated that he was troubled by the recent reduction of investments in water use efficiency; he felt this was a step in the wrong direction.

The second graphic that Mr. Evans pointed out was the California Water Balance on page 2 of the *Water Plan Highlights*. Mr. Evans stated that the Water Balance misleadingly implies that in a wet year, the majority of California's water is allocated to Wild & Scenic Rivers. He was concerned that water in the Wild & Scenic Rivers was being double-counted. He stated that all the Wild & Scenic Rivers on the west slope of the Sierra Nevada flow into large reservoirs and are used for consumptive uses downstream. He said that the North Coast Rivers, Klamath, Scott, Trinity, and the Eel all have upstream diversions that remove a large portion of water, adversely affecting salmon fisheries and other downstream environmental needs. He wondered how DWR accounted for water for Wild & Scenic, managed wetlands, consumptive use.

Mr. Evans stated that FOR will be submitting more detailed comments. Mr. Evans thanked DWR for the opportunity to comment.

Part 6 – Closing

Kamyar thanked the audience for participating in the public comment workshop and for their comments. He reminded everyone that the public review period will last through July 22, to allow for 60 days since the release of the printed Public Review Draft document.

The final comment deadline is July 22.

Attendance:

Public:

Bridget Adams, Metropolitan Water District of Southern California
David Bolland, Association of California Water Agencies
Kim Davis, Office of State Senator Sam Aanestad
Mary Ann Dickinson, California Urban Water Conservation Council
Bill DuBois, California Farm Bureau Federation
Steve Evans, Friends of the River
Amy Horne, Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board
Alisha Deen, Environmental Justice Coalition for Water
Anna Fock, MWH
Dave Forkel, Delta Wetlands
Dave Haisten, U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
Helen Lu, Sacramento Regional County Sanitation District
Jean Lund, League of Women Voters of Davis
Steve Macaulay, California Urban Water Agencies
Todd Manley, Northern California Water Association
Ken McGhee, California Bay Delta Authority
Mindy McIntyre, Planning and Conservation League
John S. Mills, Regional Council of Rural Counties
Jonas Minton, Planning and Conservation League
Cindy Nickles, Association of California Water Agencies
Greg Orum, Surface Water Resources, Inc.
Betsy Reifsnider, Friends of the River
Mark Roberson, California Bay Delta Authority
Richard Sapuder, California Energy Commission
Tracy Schohr, California Cattlemen's Association
Bernice Sullivan, Friant Water Authority
Jeff Sutton, Family Water Alliance
Robert Stackhouse, Central Valley Project Water Association
Ming-Yen Tu, MWH
Kathleen Van Velsor, Association of Bay Area Governments
Mike Vukelich, Farm Bureau
Bob Wilkinson, UC Santa Barbara
David Wright, Public

Staff:

Alan Aguilar, DWR
John Andrew, DWR
Gina Bartlett, CCP
Barbara Cross, DWR
Paul Dabbs, DWR
Kamyar Guivetchi, DWR
Marla Hambright, DWR
Paul Massera, DWR
Matt Nolberg, DWR
Mohammad Rayej, DWR
Maury Roos, DWR
David Sumi, CCP
Karl Winkler, DWR
Jean Woods, DWR
Waiman Yip, DWR